

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-20 are pending in the application, claims 1-20 stand rejected. The Examiner has also objected to the abstract of disclosure.

### Abstract of Disclosure

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his thoughtful comments regarding the abstract of disclosure, and submit that the abstract as now amended meets the requirements of MPEP §608.01(b). The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the Examiner withdraw his objection.

### Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-20 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Burg (U.S. Pat. No.: 6,193,571). The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of anticipation. With respect to the propulsor in Claims 1 and 14, Burg does not provide a steering nozzle as claimed, but only a non-movable discharge nozzle, which does not operate to steer the watercraft. Furthermore, the groove in the discharge nozzle of Burg is not used to control fluid flow but rather is used as a recess for the movement of trim elements. With respect to the propulsor in Claim 3, Burg does not provide a steering nozzle with at least two grooves. With respect to the propulsor in Claims 4 and 7, Burg does not provide a steering nozzle comprising at least one groove, wherein 75% of the groove area is located in any contiguous half of the total interior surface area of the steering nozzle. In the discharge nozzle of Burg, the two grooves appear to have only about 50% of the groove area located in any contiguous half of the total interior surface area. With respect to Claim 5, Burg does not provide a steering nozzle comprising at least one groove, wherein the groove comprises at least two sides with a distinct angle between the two sides. With respect to Claims 6, 9, 10, 15, and 16 the Applicants repeat and reiterate their previous comments. With respect to Claims 11-13 and 17-19, the Applicants have defined the meaning of the terms 0.001r, 1.5r, 0.002c, 0.4c, 0.01w and 3w in the description of the specification, see page 10, line

25 to page 11, line 27. The Applicants submit if the terms are specifically defined in the specification they do not need to be defined in the claims. Further, the Applicants submit that Burg does not provide a steering nozzle with at least one groove having these particular characteristics. With respect to Claim 20, Burg does not provide a steering nozzle comprising at least four grooves. In addition to the above comments, with respect to Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-13, Burg does not describe a watercraft using such a propulsor, but rather specifically addresses a propulsor. Given the reasons set forth in this response, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

### **Rejections under 35 USC §103**

Claims 2 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Burg in view of Kobayashi (US Pat. No. 5,603,644). The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness. With respect to Claim 2, Burg does not provide a watercraft comprising two or more propulsors or a steering nozzle comprising at least one groove in the interior surface, and Kobayashi does not provide for a steering nozzle comprising at least one groove in the interior surface. With respect to Claim 8, Burg does not provide a watercraft comprising two or more propulsors or a steering nozzle comprising at least one groove, wherein 75% of the groove area is located in any contiguous half of the total interior surface area of the steering nozzle. Further, Kobayashi does not provide a propulsor with a steering nozzle comprising at least one groove, wherein 75% of the groove area is located in any contiguous half of the total interior surface area of the steering nozzle.

In addition, the Applicants further submit that the Examiner has not given any reason, suggestion, or motivation in the references, or from the references cited as a whole for the person of ordinary skill to have combined or modified the references. The Applicants submit that obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching suggestion or incentive supporting such combination. If such suggestion or incentive is in the references, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner particularly point out the relevant sections of those references cited which suggest or motivate his combination of those references. If the Examiner is alleging that a person of ordinary skill would have

be motivated to combine such references, the Applicant respectfully submits that how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated must be in the personal knowledge of the Examiner, and therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner in his next Official Action submit an affidavit detailing as specifically as possible such motivation (see 37 CFR §1.104 (d) (2)). Given the reasons in this response, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 11-13 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burg. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a case of prima facie obviousness. The Examiner alleges that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the grooves in Burg of the claimed length width and spacing as defined in the specification and claimed. The Applicants repeat and reiterate their previous comments. In addition, the Applicants respectfully submit that how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated must be in the personal knowledge of the Examiner, and therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner in his next Official Action submit an affidavit detailing as specifically as possible such motivation (see 37 CFR §1.104 (d) (2)). Given the reasons in this response, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

### CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons the Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Nov 22, 2004  
Dated



Brian M. Kolkowski  
Reg. No.: 36,847  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Orbital Research Inc.  
4415 Euclid Avenue, Suite 500  
Cleveland, Ohio 44103  
(216) 649-0376  
Fax (216) 649-0347  
Email: kolkowski@orbitalresearch.com